

Now, sir, was the power ever given to the Federal Government to coerce a State, to carry the sword and slaughter, flame and ruin and the devastation incident to war against a recalcitrant State? You cannot find it in the grant. You may look through it, but it is not there. Not only is there an absence of any such grant, but here is a case where we are enabled to prove a negative. The power to do this very thing was asked for in the Convention and it was denied, it was refused to be given. Therefore we are not left to wild conjecture on this subject, because being asked for and refused, it cannot by any possibility be implied. Now, upon the subject of coercing a State by physical force, Alexander Hamilton said:

"It has been observed, to coerce the States is one of the saddest projects that was ever devised. A failure of compliance will never be confined to a single State; this being the case, can we suppose it wise to hazard a civil war? Suppose Massachusetts or any larger State should refuse and Congress should attempt to compel them, would they not have influence to procure assistance, especially from those States that are in the same situation as themselves? What a picture does this idea present to our view? A complying State at war with a non-complying State; Congress marching the troops of one State into the bosom of another; the State collecting auxiliaries and forming perhaps a majority against its federal head. Here is a nation at war with itself. Can any reasonable man be well disposed towards a government which makes war and carnage the only means of supporting itself?—a government that can exist only by the sword? Every such war must involve the innocent with the guilty. This single consideration should be sufficient to dispose every peaceable citizen against such a government."

George Mason, of Virginia, said:

"The most jarring elements of nature, sin and malice, are not more incompatible than such a mixture of civil liberty and military execution. Will the militia march from one State into another in order to collect the arrears of taxes from the delinquent members of the republic? Will they maintain an army for this purpose? Will not the citizens of the invaded States assist one another till they rise and shake off the Union altogether?"

The President here announced that the hour had expired.

On motion of Mr. BERRY, of Prince George's, the member was allowed fifteen minutes further time.

Mr. DENNIS. I thank the Convention for their courtesy, and will endeavor not to trespass upon their attention over the time now allowed me.

I will quote one other authority. The present minister for this country in Great Britain, Charles Francis Adams, in the House

of Representatives, January 31st, 1861, used the following language:

"Now, for one, I am not ready yet to take the responsibility of absolutely closing the door of reconciliation. I cannot persuade myself to forget the warnings that have descended to us from many of the wisest and best statesmen of all time against this rigid and haughty mode of treating great discontents. I cannot overlook the fact that in the days of our fathers, the imperious spirit of Chatham did not feel itself as sacrificing any of his proud dignity by proposing to listen to their grievances, and even to concede every reasonable demand long after they had placed themselves in armed resistance to all the power of Great Britain. Had George the Third listened to his words of wisdom, he might have saved the brightest jewel of his crown. He took the opposite course. He denied the existence of grievances. He rejected the olive branch. History records its verdict in favor of Chatham and against the king."

Mr. President; the doctrine that I am endeavoring to maintain has been styled and denounced a democratic doctrine. I am one of those who never advocated democracy in my life until the last gubernatorial election. My life, so far as it has lasted, has been whig first, whig last, whig all the time, until the whig party ceased to exist. And I say here now, that I am no democrat in the old party sense of the word. I act with them now, because in my conscience, before high heaven, I believe they are the only party in this land true to the Constitution and the Union. I have none of that spirit about me which leads me to take a course opposite to that which I would go, simply because somebody else chooses to travel the same road.

Four years ago I had the honor to be placed upon an electoral ticket for this State. To the best of my ability I bore aloft the standard of Bell and Everett, inscribed with the words "Constitution, Union." Where now are those two men? One of them, in charity I am bound to believe, battling under the starry flag he loved so well. The other, a refugee from his home, and kindred, and everything that makes life dear, in vindication of principles, which I am equally bound to believe, touch the very innermost cords of his heart. In that canvass I took the ground, and I avowed it publicly in Worcester, and Somerset, and Prince George's, in Allegany, and Harford, and wherever I went, that if I was chosen one of the electors of this State, I would vote for Breckinridge or Douglas, or anybody else that would insure the defeat of Lincoln. I did it because I believed then, and believe now, that his nomination and election or the nomination and election of any man upon a purely sectional basis, not looking for, not asking for, not expecting a vote in the other States of this Union, simply be-